5.6 SERVICES

This chapter identifies potential impacts on the provision of services to Ames Research Center from the implementation of Mitigation Measure SOCIO-1b.

A. Fire and Police

Impacts to fire and police services would be the same as presented in the DPEIS.

B. Solid Waste

Using the population and employment numbers from the Mitigated Alternative 5, the amount of new waste generated would be approximately 6,331 tonnes (6,980 tons per year).[11] This estimate is based on assumptions of 2.0 kilograms (4.5 pounds) of waste per person per day in residential units, and 1.02 kilograms (2.25 pounds) of waste per employee per day. This would be a small fraction of the 820 million kilograms (900,000 tons) per year of waste that the Newby Island Landfill receives, and so would not significantly hasten the forecasted close of that landfill in 2020. In addition, Ames currently diverts 63 percent of its solid waste from landfills through recycling and composting programs. Implementation of these programs would be required of the Bay View residents. Thus there would be no impact on regional solid waste disposal from implementation of the NADP.

Remaining information would be the same as presented in DPEIS.

C. Schools

Potential numbers of elementary and high school students in the proposed housing have been estimated using the number of new townhome and

[1] Based on information provided by the Franklin Associates *Characterization of Municipal Solid Waste in the United States, 1998 Update*. July, 1999.

apartment units. As shown in Table 5.6-1, the number of students generated under the Mitigated Alternative 5 would be 147 elementary and 40 high school students. These numbers were used as the basis for this impacts analysis.

1. Mountain View and Whisman School Districts

As described in Section 3.6 of the EIS, children at Ames Research Center would attend school in the Mountain View-Whisman School District, which serves children from kindergarten through eighth grade. The existing capacity in the Mountain View-Whisman School District as of Fall 2001 could accommodate an additional 23 students. Although Mitigated Alternative 5 would exceed the District's surplus capacity by 124 students, development under the NADP with the Mitigated Alternative 5 would also pay school Developer Impact Fees that would be used by the Mountain View-Whisman School District to build new classrooms and other necessary facilities.

Table 5.6-2 contains a comparison of the additional facilities cost generated by the students in excess of the District's current capacity and the revenue from the Developer Impact Fee. The analysis uses the Mitigated Alternative 5 as a basis for the comparison. According to this calculation, the Developer Impact Fee would generate a surplus of $11,710 above the facilities cost. Therefore, no significant impact would occur.

2. Mountain View-Los Altos Union High School District

High School-age students living at Ames Research Center would attend schools in the Mountain View-Los Altos Union High School District. As of October 2001, Los Altos High School was 121 students under capacity. This would allow more than enough space for the 40 high school students that would be expected from implementation of the NADP.

3. Cumulative Impacts

The cumulative projects identified in Chapter 2 are primarily employment generating, with relatively few residential projects. The cumulative projects include 275 additional residential units in Mountain View, which would generate 36 elementary school students and 10 high school students.

TABLE 5.6-1 **STUDENT GENERATION ESTIMATE FOR THE MITIGATED ALTERNATIVE 5**

School District	Student Generation Ratio (per unit) (a)	Alternative 5 with SOCIO-1b	
		Units	Students
Mtn View-Whisman District			
Grades K-3	0.066	1,120	74
Grades 4-5	0.029	1,120	32
Grades 6-8	0.037	1,120	41
Total Elementary (b)			**147**
Mtn View-Los Altos High			
	0.036	1,120	**40**
TOTAL STUDENTS			**187**

Notes:
(a) Student Generation Estimates from Mountain View Elementary School District Development Impact Fee Justification Study, April 27, 1999.
(b) Numbers do not sum due to rounding.

Source: Schoolhouse Services; Bay Area Economics, 2001.

TABLE 5.6-2 **MOUNTAIN VIEW-WHISMAN SCHOOL DISTRICT FACILITIES IMPACT ESTIMATE**

ADDITIONAL STUDENTS	Students	Classrooms (a)
Projected Additional Mountain View-Whisman School District Students (Net of current excess capacity in the District)	125	7
FACILITY COSTS PER ADDITIONAL CLASSROOM (b)		
Classrooms	$160,000	
Core Facilities	$57,600	
Restroom Facilities	$24,000	
Total	**$241,600**	
FACILITIES IMPACT		
NADP Developer Impact Fee (c)	$1,702,910	
Additional Facilities Cost	$1,691,200	
Surplus/(Deficit)	**$11,710**	

Notes:
(a) Students per classroom: 19.8 Based on the average classroom size in Mountain View School District in 1999. Number of classrooms rounded up to nearest whole number.
(b) Cost assumptions from Mountain View School District Developer Impact Fee Justification Study, 1999. Assumes additional classrooms will be built on existing school property due to high cost and low availability of land in Mountain View. Cost of additional classrooms assumes half are permanent and half are portable, per Mountain View School District Developer Impact Fee Justification Study, 1999.
(c) From Table 5.9-1. Fiscal Impact Summary of Alternative 5 with Mitigation Measure SOCIO-1b.
Source: Schoolhouse Services; Mountain View-Whisman School District; Bay Area Economics, 2002.

These additional elementary school students from cumulative projects exceed the current capacity of the Mountain View-Whisman School District. This impact would be mitigated through the payment of standard developer impact fees by both residential and commercial development.

The additional high school students from cumulative projects could be accommodated in the Mountain View-Los Altos Union High School District.